



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/785,270	02/20/2001	Olivier F. Prache	43100-06157	2909
25881	7590	03/04/2011		
EPSTEIN DRANGEL LLP 60 EAST 42ND STREET SUITE 2410 NEW YORK, NY 10165			EXAMINER SAID, MANSOUR M	
			ART UNIT 2629	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 03/04/2011	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mail@ipcounselors.com

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

09/785,270

Applicant(s)

PRACHE, OLIVIER F.

Examiner

MANSOUR M. SAID

Art Unit

2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 November 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SD-05)
- _____ Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- _____ Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- _____ Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office Action is in response to the petition that was granted on 11/19, 04, and as a result, the amendment filed on September 20, 2004 has been revived. Further, as indicate on page 1 of the amendment filed on 9/20/04, claim 13 has been cancelled, and also, on page 3, the Applicant indicated that claims 14-22 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin (6,323,836 B1) in view of Kuga (5,828,367).

As to claim 1, Shin teaches that a display apparatus for displaying input image data, comprising a display generator (clock generator, (figures 7 & 9)), the display generator (controller, (figures 7 & 9)) adapted to provide a display output by employing image data (abstract, column 3, lines 32-63, column 5, lines 28-53 & column 6, lines 67); a buffer (memory, figures 7 & 9, (230)) coupled to the display generator (clock generator, (figures 7 & 9)) the buffer storing image data corresponding to the image data employed by the display generator (abstract, column 5, lines 28-65 & column 6, lines 20-40); and a first data update rate and a

second rate (figure 8, (column 5, lines 54-67)), the second rate is lower than the first rate (figure 8, abstract and column 5, lines 54-67)), whereby the power consumption of the display device is reduced by the selective receiving of the input image data (column 3, lines 10-15).

Shin does not disclose that a reception circuit coupled to the image buffer, receiving input image data and update the image data in the buffer.

However, Kuga teaches a reception circuit (control unit, (figure 1, (10)) coupled to the image buffer (driver, (figure 1, (9), receiving input image data and update the image data in the buffer (column 3, lines 10-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Kuga's teaching into Shin's system so as to reduce a power consumption without substantial deterioration in the quality of the image displayed (column 1, lines 55-61).

As to claim 4, Kuga teaches that the reception circuit gates the input image databased on occurrences of a vertical synchronization pulse (column 1, lines 28-52, column 4, lines 30-43 and column 6, lines 30-45).

4. Claims 2-3, 5-8, and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin in view of Kuga as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ilcisin et al. (5,978,052; hereinafter referred to as Ilcisin).

As to claim 2, Shin and Kuga teach all claimed limitation except that an analog storage element, and digital storage element.

However, Ilcisin teach that the buffer is selected from the group consisting of an analog storage element, and digital storage element and both analog and digital storage elements (column 3, lines 49-59 and column 4, lines 1-26).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have Ilcisin's teaching into Shin's modified device so as to increase the versatility of the device.

As to claims 3 and 5, Shin and Kuga teach all claimed limitation but the input image data in increments of at least one frame/ at least one line from a plurality of input image data frames.

However, Ilcisin teaches that but the input image data in increments of at least one frame/ at least one line from a plurality of input image data frames (abstract, column 3, lines 65-67, column 4, lines 1-67 and column 5, lines 13-27).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have Ilcisin's teaching into Shin's modified device so as to increase the versatility of the device.

As to claim 6, Ilcisin teaches that a counter for tracking which of said at least one line is to be received (column 5, lines 13-27).

As to claim 7, Ilcisin teaches that input image data in increments of at least one pixel cell (column 4, lines 53-67 and column 5, lines 13-27).

As to claim 8, Ilcisin teaches that a memory array for storing pixel cell data (column 4, lines 53-67).

As to claim 10, Kuga teaches that the memory (memory, (figure 1, (13)) array further comprises an interface controller (storage controller, (figure 1, (12)) (column 3, lines 25-37).

As to claim 11, Kuga teaches that the input image data to memory array elements corresponding to image pixels (figure 1, column 4, and lines 30-43).

As to claim 12, Kuga teaches that The apparatus of claim 1, wherein the reception circuit is adapted to alternatively receive the input image data at the first rate to provide a substantially real-time video display (figure 1 and column 3, lines 12-67).

5. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin in view of Kuga as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Arias-Estrada (6,253,161 B1).

Shin and Kuga teach all claimed limitation in claim 9 except that at least one pixel cell comprises a static RAM cell.

However, Arias-Estrada teach that at least one pixel cell comprises a static RAM cell (column 8, lines 18-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have Arias-Estrada's teaching into Shin's modified device so as to increase the versatility of the device.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 9/20/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argued that "the Examiner's rejection was based on Shin; in view of Kuga ... Shin alone would not support this rejection, as rejected claims required a "reception

circuit"... The Examiner is incorrect in alleging that that Kuga teaches a reception circuit ... Thus, the Examiner has not shown that claims 1 and 4 are unpatentable over Shin in view of Kuga, and further, Applicant argued that all claims 2-3 & 5-12 to independent claims which, demonstrated above.

However, The Examiner respectfully disagrees for the following reasons. For example, in the claim 1 of the application recited that the reception circuit adapted t update the image data in the buffer with the selectively received image data whereby the power consumption of the display device is reduced, and similarly, the reference of Shin discloses that the control unit for controlling the driver so that, when the comparison unit (selecting) determines that the image signals to be supplied to the display section are those for a constant image display, the power requirements of the display arrangement are reduced. As a result, Shin's system has similar functionality as the Application. Accordingly, since the Applicant has submitted no persuasive evidence that the combination of the above elements is uniquely challenging or difficult for one of ordinary skill in the art, the claim is unpatentable as obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Therefore, the combination all references discloses the claimed limitations, and all references should be taken in combination and not individually. **The Applicant cannot show non-obviousness by attacking references individually where, as here the rejections are based on combination of references. In re Keller, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).**

Conclusion

7. **THIS OFFICE ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **MANSOUR M. SAID** whose telephone number is (571)272-7679. The examiner can normally be reached on MF (8:30-6:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Quan-Zhen Wang** can be reached on (571) 272-3114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/MANSOUR M SAID/

Examiner, Art Unit 2629

/Quan-Zhen Wang/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629